



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/343,969	06/30/1999	STEVE BLUMENAU	E0295/7097	8523

7590 01/23/2004

ROBERT A SKRIVANEK JR
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS PC
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210

EXAMINER

DINH, DUNG C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2004

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/343,969

Applicant(s)

BLUMENAU ET AL.

Examiner

Dung Dinh

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2153

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/17/03 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/17/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant essentially raises similar arguments addressed in the prior office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2153

Claims 1 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. US patent 6,041,345 and further in view of Bormann et al. US patent 6,157,378.

As per claims 1 and 37, Chen teaches a storage system [col.4 lines 34-41 - mass storage devices 180] that is assessable by a plurality of processors [col.3 lines 56-68 - Internet appliances and other network components] over a network. Chen teaches assigning to each processor a portion of the storage system [col. 4 lines 34-36, col.5 lines 15-34]. Chen does not teach displaying representation of processors that are logged into the storage system. Chen does not teach any means for administering the storage system. Bormann teaches a method for coordinate and administer a system where plural operators can simultaneously logged into the system by providing a graphical user interface that displays representation of processors that are logged into the system and displays the login information [see 3 lines 35-45, col.8 lines 1-11, claim 1]. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the teaching of Bormann et al. to Chen et al. because it would have provided a graphical interface for coordinating and managing accesses to the storage system of Chen.

Claims 2-36 and 38-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen and Bormann and further in view of Jacoby US patent 5,768,552.

As per claims 2-36 and 38-61, Chen and Bormann do not teach displaying representation of path through the network over which each processor is logged into the storage system. Jacoby teaches a graphical method for monitoring and display connections to enable an administrator to visually monitor connection paths on the network in real-time [abstract, col.2 lines 34-37, col.4 lines 35-40]. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the network management method of Jacoby to the system of Chen because it would have provided real-time activity status to the storage system. Jacoby teaches displaying connection paths and graphical representation of host processor [fig.3's] at various level of details. The various presentations of information and commands would have been apparent in the system as modified.

Jacoby does not teach displaying a graphical representation of a network card to on which a respective processor is logged into the storage system. The graphical image chosen to represent a host processor would clearly have been a matter of design choice because the image chosen would not have affected the underlying management function.

Art Unit: 2153

Claims 62-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. US patent 6,041,345 and further in view of IBM TDB No.NB9203306 "Graphical User Interface for Security Administration."

As per claims 62, 68, 74, and 80, Chen discloses method for changing access privileges to portion of data on a storage system over a network [fig.2, col.5 lines 5-15]. Chen does not teach a graphical user interface for displaying and enabling modification of the privileges in response to a graphical selection. The IBM TDB teaches providing a graphical user interface for security administration. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the teaching of the IBM TDB with Chen et al. because it would have provided means to administer the system from a graphical user interface and prevented the administrator from having to know or remember commands or syntax to accomplish the task.

Chen does not specifically disclose first and second volumes. However, Chen teaches the network storage is used as a replacement for actual physical hard drive in the Internet appliance; hence, the allocated network storage functions as a storage volume as claimed because the Internet appliance would have accessed the network storage in place of a physical local hard drive. Having multiple volumes is an inherent capability of a storage system. It

Art Unit: 2153

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide plural volumes because it would have provided logically and/or functionally separate areas for data storage.

As per claims 63-67, 69-73, 81-85, it is apparent that the system as modified would have the steps of displaying graphical presentation and modifying of access privileges in response to selection of the graphical presentation. The IBM TDB reference does not teach displaying a graphical representation of a network card to graphically represent a host processor. It graphical image chosen to represent a host processor would clearly a matter of design choice because the image chosen would not have affected the underlying function of the graphical user interface.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (703) 305-4792.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 2100 Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-5631.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231


Application/Control Number: 09/343,969

Page 7

Art Unit: 2153

or faxed to: (703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II,
2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dung Dinh', with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Dung Dinh
Primary Examiner
January 21, 2004